arXiv:1612.09357v1 [stat.CO] 30 Dec 2016

# Sparse Learning with Semi-Proximal-Based Strictly Contractive Peaceman-Rachford Splitting Method

**Sen Na**
Department of Statistics, The University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60615 USA
senna@uchicago.edu

**Cho-Jui Hsieh**
Department of Statistics, University of California, Davis
Davis, CA 95616 USA
chohsieh@ucdavis.edu

## Abstract

Minimizing sum of two functions under a linear constraint is what we called splitting problem. This convex optimization has wide applications in machine learning problems, such as Lasso, Group Lasso and Sparse logistic regression. A recent paper by Gu et al (2015) developed a Semi-Proximal-Based Strictly Contractive Peaceman-Rachford Splitting Method (SPB-SPRSM), which is an extension of Strictly Contractive Peaceman-Rachford Splitting Method (SPRSM) proposed by He et al (2014). By introducing semi-proximal terms and using two different relaxation factors, SPB-SPRSM showed a more flexiable applicability comparing to its origin SPRSM and widely-used Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) algorithm, although all of them have $O(1/t)$ convergence rate. In this paper, we develop a stochastic version of SPB-SPRSM algorithm, where only a subset of samples (even one sample) are used at each iteration. The resulting algorithm, Stochastic SPB-SPRSM, is more flexiable than Stochastic ADMM and other ADMM-based algorithms on both simulations and real datasets. Moreover, we prove $O(1/\sqrt{t})$ convergence rate in ergodic sense, which is the same with Stochastic ADMM algorithm under the same assumption. But as shown in He et al (2014) that SPRSM based algorithms will always converge faster than ADMM in apllication, our proposed algorithm will also preserve this advantage.

## 1 Introduction

We mainly consider the convex minimization problem with a separable objective function and a linear constraint. The problem can be formulated as:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X},\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathcal{Y}} \theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}) + \theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}) \text{ s.t. } A\boldsymbol{x} + B\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{b}, \tag{1}$$

where $\theta_1 : \mathfrak{R}^{d_1} \to \mathfrak{R}$ and $\theta_2 : \mathfrak{R}^{d_2} \to \mathfrak{R}$ are continuous closed convex functions and $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ are nonempty closed convex sets. Typically, $\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\theta_{1i}(\boldsymbol{x})$, where $n$ is the number of observations and $\theta_{1i}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is the convex loss incurred on observation $i$, and $\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y})$ is the structural regularizer constraint.

This minimization problem can be solved by a group of splitting algorithms. The Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) [7, 6, 2] proposed in 1970s is one of the simplest methods. It provides a flexible framework to handle each function individually. As shown in previous paper

29th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS 2016), Barcelona, Spain.

[5], ADMM is equivalent to applying Douglas-Rachford Splitting Method (DRSM) [3, 11] to the dual problem of (1). Many papers have analyzed the convergence properties of ADMM [5, 8, 4].

The Peaceman-Rachford Splitting Method (PRSM) [13, 11] has also been developed to solve the splitting problem (1). It often converges faster than ADMM, but requires extra assumptions to ensure the convergence. Recently, a modified version called Strictly Contractive PRSM (SPRSM) was proposed by He et al. (2014). They relax the requirements of PRSM by employing a suitable underdetermined relaxation factor, which makes it convergent under the same assumption with ADMM. They also report that PRSM based algorithms are usually faster than ADMM on many simulated and real datasets though they have same convergence rate.

Additionally, Semi-Proximal-Based SPRSM, an extension of SPRSM, was proposed by Gu et al. (2015) [9] recently. They add semi-proximal terms in the iteration scheme of SPRSM with two different relaxation factors to make SPRSM more flexible. They also characteriz the relation of these two factors and showed one factor is always underdetermined, like SPRSM, while the other one is allowed to be greater than 1. Such modification make it possible to choose larger stepsize in iterations.

However, when the dataset has a large sample size, all the above algorithms cannot scale well because they adopt the "batch" setting, which means they need to use all sample points at each iteration. So, regradless of ADMM, PRSM, SPRSM, or SPB-SPRSM, they are all not suitable for big data applications. To alleviate this problem, on the other hand, a family of stochastic algorithms have been proposed [12, 15, 14], where only one or a mini-batch of samples are used at each iteration. Due to the scalability to large datasets, stochastic algorithms have become a popular research topic [12, 15, 14, 16, 1]. Comparing to batch algorithm, consuming time for each iteration is much less in stochastic algorithm though it also loses some informations. So, convergence rate for stochasic algorithm is usually under ergodic sense (only hope the mean is as close to true value as possible).

In this paper, we propose a stochastic version of the SPB-SPRSM algorithm. The final algorithm, Stochastic SPB-SPRSM, only requires one or a small subset of training samples at each time. As a consequence, our algorithm can be easily scaled to problems with a large number of training data, and the convergence performance is also better than previous Stochastic ADMM and other related algorithms. Our work can be summarized as follows:

1. Motivated by Ouyang et al. (2013), we propose the Stochastic SPB-SPRSM algorithm by forming the first order approximated Lagrangian and only using a small portion of training samples at each step. Our algorithm is useful if problems are with large sample size as well as high dimensional model parameters.
2. As analyzed in a recent paper [9], we also add two proximal terms to subproblems in updating the $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ and use two different relaxation factors. Then, we prove the iteration sequence generated by Stochastic SPB-SPRSM is contractive under the same requirement as SPB-SPRSM:

$$\alpha \in [0,1)\,, \gamma \in \left(0, \frac{1-\alpha+\sqrt{(1+\alpha)^2+4(1-\alpha^2)}}{2}\right)$$

   ,
   where $\alpha$ and $\gamma$ are two relaxation factors. After suitable settings, we can get several stochastic algorithms, like Stochastic ADMM and Stochastic SPRSM.
3. We show that the convergence rate of the proposed algorithm is $O(1/\sqrt{t})$ in the ergodic sense under the same assumptions with previous Stochastic ADMM algorithms and $O(\log(t)/t)$ in the strong convexity case. So, we also unify how to analyze the convergence rate of Stochastic SPRSM ($\alpha = \gamma$) and Stochastic ADMM ($\alpha = \gamma$ goes to 1).
4. We conduct experimental comparisons with Stochastic ADMM algorithms and other related algorithms on several simulated and real datasets.

We begin by presenting the background of splitting problem in Section 2. In Section 3, we propose the iteration of our main algorithm (Stochastic SPB-SPRSM). The main results of convergence rate is provided in Section 4. The experimental results on simulated and real datasets are presented in Section 5. Finally, we give conclusions as well as future directions in Section 6. Our proofs are included in the appendix.

**Algorithm 1** Deterministic ADMM

Initialize $y_0$ and $\lambda_0 = 0$.
**for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
  $x_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{x \in \chi} L_\beta(x, y_k; \lambda_k)$.
  $y_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} L_\beta(x_{k+1}, y; \lambda_k)$.
  $\lambda_{k+1} \leftarrow \lambda_k - \beta(Ax_{k+1} + By_{k+1} - b)$.
**end for**

## 2 Background

In this section, we first present the stochastic optimization problem we want to solve, and then introduce several related algorithms: ADMM, SPRSM, SPB-SPRSM and Stochastic ADMM.

### 2.1 Stochastic Setting

We mainly analyze the convex stochastic optimization problem of the form:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} E_\xi \theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}, \xi) + \theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}) \text{ s.t. } A\boldsymbol{x} + B\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{b}, \tag{2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Re^{d_1}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \Re^{d_2}, A \in \Re^{m \times d_1}, B \in \Re^{m \times d_2}, \boldsymbol{b} \in \Re^m$; $\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}, \xi)$ is the instance function value while $\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}) = E_\xi \theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}, \xi)$ is its expectation; $\theta_2 : \Re^{d_2} \to \Re$ is a composite function; both $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$ are convex functions but can be nonsmooth; $\mathcal{X}$ is a convex compact set and $\mathcal{Y}$ is a closed convex set. The random variable $\xi$ follows some fixed but unknown distribution $P$, and we are able to draw a sequence of independent and identically distributed samples from this distribution. When $\xi$ is deterministic, we can recover the original problem formulation (1), and the algorithm also becomes deterministic (batch) algorithm.

Problem (2) covers the following structural risk minimization problems in machine learning:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}} E_\xi L(\boldsymbol{x}, \xi) + R(\boldsymbol{x}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}$ is the model parameter, $L(\cdot, \xi)$ is the loss function on a sample $\xi$, and $R(\cdot)$ is the regularizer that imposes some structural constraints. If the training dataset with $n$ samples is given, the empirical risk minimization problem $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n L(\boldsymbol{x}, \xi_i) + R(\boldsymbol{x})$ can also be modeled this way where $\xi$ is uniformly sampled from training samples. Note that the structural regularizer can often be non-smooth, throughout this paper we assume $\theta_1, \theta_2$ are convex but may be non-smooth (all assumptions are same with Stochastic ADMM).

The stochastic optimization algorithms for solving (2) are more suitable for large-scale machine learning problems compared with batch algorithms. In the stochastic setting, the algorithm only observe one sample or a subset of samples at each time, where $\xi$ indicates a sample or a subset of samples respectively. This is especially important when (i) the dataset is larger than the memory or (ii) the data points come from a streaming model. Therefore, many recent papers [12, 15, 14, 16, 1] are discussing Stochastic ADMM algorithm or incremental algorithms for solving problem (2).

### 2.2 Related Batch Algorithms

We first discuss the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) for solving (1), which aims to minimize the following augmented Lagrangian:

$$L_\beta(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}) + \theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}) - \langle \lambda,\ A\boldsymbol{x} + B\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{b} \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2}\|A\boldsymbol{x} + B\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{b}\|^2,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Re^m$ is the Lagrangian multipliers and $\beta > 0$ is a penalty parameter. The ADMM algorithm minimizes $L_\beta$ in a Gauss-Seidel manner—sequentially updating $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ at each iteration, as shown in Algorithm 1.

Peaceman-Rachford Splitting Method (PRSM) is another way to minimize the Lagrangian [13, 11]. Applying PRSM, we obtain another iterative scheme in Algorithm 2. As pointed out in Gabay & Mercer (1976), the only difference between PRSM and ADMM, the addition of the intermediate

**Algorithm 2** Peaceman-Rachford Splitting Method

Initialize $y_0$ and $\lambda_0 = 0$.
**for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
$x_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{x \in \chi} L_\beta(x, y_k; \lambda_k)$.
$\lambda_{k+1/2} \leftarrow \lambda_k - \beta(Ax_{k+1} + By_k - b)$.
$y_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} L_\beta(x_{k+1}, y; \lambda_{k+1/2})$.
$\lambda_{k+1} \leftarrow \lambda_{k+1/2} - \beta(Ax_{k+1} + By_{k+1} - b)$.
**end for**

**Algorithm 3** Strictly Contractive PRSM

Initialize $y_0$ and $\lambda_0 = 0$.
**for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
$x_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{x \in \chi} L_\beta(x, y_k; \lambda_k)$.
$\lambda_{k+1/2} \leftarrow \lambda_k - \alpha\beta(Ax_{k+1} + By_k - b)$.
$y_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} L_\beta(x_{k+1}, y; \lambda_{k+1/2})$.
$\lambda_{k+1} \leftarrow \lambda_{k+1/2} - \alpha\beta(Ax_{k+1} + By_{k+1} - b)$.
**end for**

step $\lambda_{k+1/2}$, although not improve the convergence rate, this leads to a faster contraction speed in experiment whenever it is convergent. Unfortunately, also due to the same modification, PRSM becomes less robust—it converges under more restrictive assumptions than ADMM. The reason for the convergence difference, is that the iterative sequence generated by DRSM is strictly contractive, while that generated by PRSM is only contractive with respect to the solution set of the model.

To make PRSM convergent in more general cases, as the variant of PRSM, Strictly Contractive PRSM was recently proposed in [10], and applied to many statistical learning models such as Lasso, Group Lasso, Sparse logistic regression and image processing. The key idea is to employ an underdetermined relaxation factor $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ when updating the Lagrange multipliers $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ (see Algorithm 3).

Recently, a new variant of PRSM called Semi-Proximal-Based SPRSM was published [9] and it could cover the SPRSM case. Because the relaxation factor in two iteration step play different roles (one is for updating $\boldsymbol{y}$ and one is for updating $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$), they naturally used two different relaxation factors and also introduced two positive semi-definite matrices in subproblems. All work can make SPRSM easy to apply (see Algorithm 4).

### 2.3 Related Stochastic Algorithms

For making algorithm possible to apply to a large scale dataset, many researchers focused on a family of stochastic algorithms in the past fewc years. The pioneer paper [15] presents the algorithm in the online setting, but they only proved the convergence rate for the online regret. The Stochastic ADMM algorithm [12] first explicitly focused on solving the stochastic version of (2). At each iteration, the algorithm samples a $\xi_{k+1}$ (corresponding to one or a subset of samples), and use this information to update the parameters from $(\boldsymbol{x}^k, \boldsymbol{y}^k, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k)$ to $(\boldsymbol{x}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{y}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1})$. We will describe the detailed settings in the next section. Since at each iteration it only requires a small number of samples, the algorithm is more suitable for large-scale problems, and it was shown in Ouyang et al. (2013) that the

**Algorithm 4** Semi-Proximal-Based SPRSM

Initialize $y_0$ and $\lambda_0 = 0$; Suppose $S, T \succcurlyeq 0$.
**for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
$x_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{x \in \chi} L_\beta(x, y_k; \lambda_k) + \frac{1}{2}\|x - x_k\|_S^2$.
$\lambda_{k+1/2} \leftarrow \lambda_k - \alpha\beta(Ax_{k+1} + By_k - b)$.
$y_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} L_\beta(x_{k+1}, y; \lambda_{k+1/2}) + \frac{1}{2}\|y - y_k\|_T^2$.
$\lambda_{k+1} \leftarrow \lambda_{k+1/2} - \gamma\beta(Ax_{k+1} + By_{k+1} - b)$.
**end for**

averaged iterates $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_t := \frac{1}{t}\sum_{i=1}^{t}\boldsymbol{x}_i$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_t := \frac{1}{t}\sum_{i=1}^{t}\boldsymbol{y}_{i+1}$ have the following bound:

$$E\left[\theta_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_t)+\theta_2(\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_t)-\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}^*)-\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}^*)+\rho\|A\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_t+B\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_t-\boldsymbol{b}\|_2\right]=O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ are optimal solutions.

Due to the application in large-scale problems, many papers [14, 16, 1] improve the algorithm and/or analysis of Stochastic ADMM within these two years.

### 2.4 Notations

All notations are consistent throughout the paper and supplement material. We denote the objective function as $\theta(\boldsymbol{u})=\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x})+\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y})$; the constraint function as $\boldsymbol{r}(\boldsymbol{w})=A\boldsymbol{x}+B\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{b}$ and its $k$th iteration as $\boldsymbol{r}_k=A\boldsymbol{x}_k+B\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{b}$; the residual term as $\delta_k=\theta_1'(x_{k-1},\xi_k)-\theta_1'(x_{k-1})$. For simplicity, we define the following vectors that will be used in this paper:

$$\boldsymbol{u}=\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{x}\\ \boldsymbol{y}\end{pmatrix},\boldsymbol{v}=\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{y}\\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}\end{pmatrix},\boldsymbol{w}=\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{x}\\ \boldsymbol{y}\\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}\end{pmatrix},\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_t=\begin{pmatrix}\frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\boldsymbol{x}_k\\ \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}\end{pmatrix},\bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_t=\begin{pmatrix}\frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}\\ \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}\\ \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}\end{pmatrix},$$

$$F(\boldsymbol{w})=\begin{pmatrix}-A^T\boldsymbol{\lambda}\\ -B^T\boldsymbol{\lambda}\\ A\boldsymbol{x}+B\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{b}\end{pmatrix},P=\begin{pmatrix}S&0\\ 0&T\end{pmatrix},M=\begin{pmatrix}I_{n_2}&0\\ \alpha\beta B&(\alpha+\gamma)\beta I_m\end{pmatrix},$$

$$G=\begin{pmatrix}P&0\\ 0&0\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix}0&0\\ 0&H\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}S&0&0\\ 0&T+\frac{\alpha+\gamma-\alpha\gamma}{\alpha+\gamma}\beta B^TB&-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\gamma}B^T\\ 0&-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\gamma}B&\frac{1}{(\alpha+\gamma)\beta}I_m\end{pmatrix},$$

$$K=\begin{pmatrix}(1-\alpha)\beta B^TB&(1-\alpha)\beta\\ (1-\alpha)\beta&(2-\alpha-\gamma)\beta I_m\end{pmatrix},H=\frac{1}{\alpha+\gamma}\begin{pmatrix}(\alpha+\gamma-\alpha\gamma)\beta B^TB&-\alpha B^T\\ -\alpha B&\frac{1}{\beta}I_m\end{pmatrix}.$$

For positive semidefinite matrix $G$, we also define $G$-norm of $x$ as $||x||_G=\sqrt{x^TGx}$. For function $f$, we use $f'$ to denote a subgradient of $f$ and if $f$ is differentiable, we denote its derivative as $\nabla f$. We also assume the optimal solution exists and define the supremum distance: $D_X=\sup\{||x_a-x_b||x_a,x_b\in X\}$.

## 3 Stochastic Semi-Proximal-Based SPRSM

For the stochastic setting, we define the following the approximated augmented Lagrange function:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{L}_{\beta,k}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\lambda}):=\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}_k)+\langle\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1}),\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k\rangle+\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y})-\langle\boldsymbol{\lambda},A\boldsymbol{x}+B\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{b}\rangle\\ +\frac{\beta}{2}\|A\boldsymbol{x}+B\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{b}\|_2^2+\frac{1}{2\eta_{k+1}}\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k\|^2,\end{aligned}$$

where we use $\theta_1'$ to denote a subgradient of $\theta_1$, $\eta_{k+1}$ is the time-varying step size, and $\xi_{k+1}$ is sampled from some fixed but unknown distribution $P$. As shown in Section 4, the choice of $\eta_k$ is crucial for the convergence of the algorithm, where different choices will give different convergence rates.

Comparing to $L_\beta$, this augmented function approximate $\theta_1(\cdot)$ by its first order approximation $\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}_k+\Delta)\approx\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}_k)+\langle\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1}),\Delta\rangle+\frac{1}{2\eta_{k+1}}\|\Delta\|^2$, where the subgradient is evaluated using the current samples $\xi_{k+1}$, this leads to the following two computational benefits: (i) Only a subset of samples is used at each time, and (ii) the update for $\boldsymbol{x}$ is in closed form even when $\theta_1$ is a complicated loss function (such as the logistic regression loss). Based on the definition of saddle point $(\boldsymbol{x}^*,\boldsymbol{y}^*,\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$, we have:

$$\hat{L}_{\beta,k}(\boldsymbol{x}^*,\boldsymbol{y}^*,\boldsymbol{\lambda})\le\hat{L}_{\beta,k}(\boldsymbol{x}^*,\boldsymbol{y}^*,\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)\le\hat{L}_{\beta,k}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)\ \ \forall\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X},\forall\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathcal{Y},\forall\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\Lambda,$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}^*,\boldsymbol{y}^*,\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$ are optimal solutions.

Based on this approximated Lagrange function, we propose a Stochastic SPB-SPRSM algorithm in Algorithm 6. The key idea is to replace step 1 and 3 (in Algorithm 4) by minimizing the approximated

**Algorithm 5** Stochastic ADMM

Initialize $x_0$, $y_0$ and set $\lambda_0 = 0$.
**for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
  $x_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{x \in \chi} \hat{L}_{\beta,k}(x, y_k, \lambda_k)$.
  $y_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \hat{L}_{\beta,k}(x_{k+1}, y, \lambda_k)$.
  $\lambda_{k+1} \leftarrow \lambda_k - \beta(Ax_{k+1} + By_{k+1} - b)$.
**end for**

**Algorithm 6** Stochastic SPB-SPRSM

Initialize $x_0$, $y_0$ and set $\lambda_0 = 0$; Suppose $S, T \succcurlyeq 0$.
**for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
  $x_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{x \in \chi} \hat{L}_{\beta,k}(x, y_k, \lambda_k) + \frac{1}{2}\|x - x_k\|_S^2$.
  $\lambda_{k+1/2} \leftarrow \lambda_k - \alpha\beta(Ax_{k+1} + By_k - b)$.
  $y_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \hat{L}_{\beta,k}(x_{k+1}, y, \lambda_{k+1/2}) + \frac{1}{2}\|y - y_k\|_T^2$.
  $\lambda_{k+1} \leftarrow \lambda_{k+1/2} - \gamma\beta(Ax_{k+1} + By_{k+1} - b)$.
**end for**

Lagrangian. Note that our algorithm is very similar to the Stochastic ADMM algorithm 5 proposed in [12]. They replaced the updates of $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}$ in ADMM to approximate the Lagrangian, while we use the SPB-SPRSM approach to update the dual variables $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, not only adding semi-proximal terms in iterations of $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$, but also use two different relaxation factors. All of work can make Stochastic ADMM more flexible. We will show that our update rule for $\boldsymbol{x}$, $\boldsymbol{y}$, and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ leads to a faster convergence speed on both synthetic and real experiments.

## 4 Convergence Analysis

In this section, we will show that our Stochastic SPB-SPRSM has a rate $O(1/\sqrt{t})$ of convergence under the same assumptions of Stochastic ADMM. That is:

$$E\left[\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_t) - \theta(\boldsymbol{u}^*) + \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_t - \boldsymbol{w}^*, F(\boldsymbol{w}^*)\rangle\right] = O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{w}^*$ are the optimal solution. Note that although the results are the same with Stochastic ADMM [12], some parts of the proof is quite different because the updating scheme of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is Gauss-Seidel manner. Note that if we set $S = T = 0$ and $\alpha = 0, \gamma = 1$, we get Stochastic ADMM algorithm and our convergence conclusions are the same with Stochastic ADMM. If we set $\alpha = \gamma \in (0, 1)$, we get Stochastic SPRSM. So, we can claim that the convergence rate of Stochastic SPRSM is also $O(1/\sqrt{t})$. From this point, we unify the convergence rate of several stochastic algorithms. Moreover, if $\theta_1$ is strongly convex function, we can strength the rate to $O(\log(t)/t)$. All proofs in this section are provided in the supplement material, and we just list the important lemmas and a sketch of the proof here.

**Assumptions.** To prove the convergence results, we need the following assumptions:

1. $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$ are convex functions but not necessary smooth.
2. For $\forall x \in X$, we have $E[||\theta_1'(x_k, \xi_{k+1})||^2] \leq N^2$, where $N$ is a constant.

**Proof Sketch.** In the following, we list four important lemmas for getting the final theorem.

**Lemma 1.** *In Stochastic SPB-SPRSM (Algorithm 6), let the sequence $\boldsymbol{w}_k$ be generate by iteration scheme. If we define*

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 =& \theta(\boldsymbol{u}) - (\theta_1(x_k) + \theta_2(y_{k+1})) + \langle x - x_k, \delta_{k+1}\rangle + \frac{\eta_{k+1}}{2}\|\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \xi_{k+1})\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\eta_{k+1}}(\|\boldsymbol{x}_k - \boldsymbol{x}\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{x}\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

$$P_2 = \big\langle \boldsymbol{w} - \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}, \begin{pmatrix} S(x_{k+1} - x_k) \\ T(y_{k+1} - y_k) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \alpha\beta B^T r_{k+1} + (1-\alpha)\beta B^T B(y_{k+1} - y_k) \\ -\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\gamma} B(y_{k+1} - y_k) + \frac{1}{(\alpha+\gamma)\beta}(\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k) \end{pmatrix} \big\rangle,$$

$$P_3 = \langle \boldsymbol{w} - \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}, \begin{pmatrix} A^T \\ B^T \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} (1-\alpha-\gamma)\beta r_{k+1} + (1-\alpha)\beta B(y_k - y_{k+1}) \rangle.$$

*Then for any $\boldsymbol{w} \in \Omega = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \Lambda$, we have*

$$P_1 + P_2 + P_3 \geq \langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}) \rangle.$$

Next, we handle the $P_2$ and $P_3$ term respectively, and we have the further result:

**Lemma 2.** *Let the sequence $\boldsymbol{w}_k$ be generate by iteration scheme. If $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\gamma > 0$, then for any $\boldsymbol{w} \in \Omega$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} 2P_1 + \|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 - \|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 \geq \|\boldsymbol{u}_k - \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + (1-\alpha)\beta\|B(y_k - y_{k+1})\|^2 \\ + (2 - \alpha - \gamma)\beta\|r_{k+1}\|^2 + 2(1-\alpha)\beta\langle r_{k+1}, B(y_k - y_{k+1})\rangle \\ + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we focus on the term $\langle r_{k+1}, B(y_k - y_{k+1})\rangle$. For all $\boldsymbol{w} \in \Omega$, we have following Lemma.

**Lemma 3.** *Let the sequence $\boldsymbol{w}_k$ be generate by iteration scheme. If $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\gamma > 0$, then for any $\boldsymbol{w} \in \Omega$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle r_{k+1}, B(y_k - y_{k+1})\rangle \geq & \frac{1-\gamma}{1+\alpha}\langle r_k, B(y_k - y_{k+1})\rangle - \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|B(y_k - y_{k+1})\|^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)\beta}(\|y_{k+1} - y_k\|_T^2 - \|y_k - y_{k-1}\|_T^2). \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.** *Let the sequence $\boldsymbol{w}_k$ be generate by iteration scheme. If $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1-\alpha+\sqrt{(1+\alpha)^2+4(1-\alpha^2)}}{2})$, then for any $\boldsymbol{w} \in \Omega$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\alpha,\gamma}\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}_k\|_G^2 + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle \geq 2P_1 \\ + (\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \eta_\alpha\|y_k - y_{k-1}\|_T^2 + \rho_{\alpha,\gamma}\beta\|r_k\|^2) \\ - (\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \eta_\alpha\|y_{k+1} - y_k\|_T^2 + \rho_{\alpha,\gamma}\beta\|r_{k+1}\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

*where $\eta_\alpha, \rho_{\alpha,\gamma} \geq 0$ and $\tau_{\alpha,\gamma} \in (0, 1)$.*

Based on all the above lemmas, we can derive the convergence rate of the averaged iterates $\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}$ by the following two theorems:

**Theorem 1** (Main Theorem)**.** *If $\theta_1, \theta_2$ are convex and $\eta_k = Ck^{-p}$ with $p \in (0, 1)$ and any positive constant $C$, then under Assumptions 1 and 2, the averaged iterates $\bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_t = [\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_t^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_t^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t^T]^T$ generated by Algorithm 6 satisfy $\forall t \geq 1$*

$$E[\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_t) - \theta(\boldsymbol{u}^*) + \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_t - \boldsymbol{w}^*, F(\boldsymbol{w}^*)\rangle] \leq \frac{D}{2t} + \frac{D_X^2}{2Ct^{1-p}} + \frac{N^2 C}{2(1-p)t^p}.$$

Based on the above theorem, when we choose $\eta_k = O(k^{-\frac{1}{2}})$, the convergence rate will be $O(1/\sqrt{t})$ in the ergodic sense.

**Theorem 2** (Strong Convexity Case)**.** *If $\theta_1$ is a $\mu$-strongly convex function, setting $\eta_k = \frac{1}{k\mu}$, under Assumption 1 and 2, we have $\forall t \geq 1$*

$$E[\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_t) - \theta(\boldsymbol{u}^*) + \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_t - \boldsymbol{w}^*, F(\boldsymbol{w}^*)\rangle] \leq \frac{D}{2t} + \frac{N^2 \log(t)}{\mu t}.$$

Based on this theorem, we can see our proposed algorithm has $O(\log(t)/t)$ convergence rate if $\theta_1$ is strongly convex function.

Note that the convergence rate and the assumptions are exactly the same as the Stochastic ADMM [12, 1], but we observe a faster contraction speed in practice due to the new update rule for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. Comparing to [1], the convergence rate is also the same under the mild condition that $\theta_1$ is convex but may not be strongly convex.

## 5 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we apply our Stochastic SPB-SPRSM algorithm to some models in statistical learning and compare the iteration efficiency with stochastic ADMM-typed algorithms. We focus on Lasso, Group Lasso, and Sparse logistic regression problems, derive the update rule for each model, and conduct experiments on both simulated and real datasets.

**Competing Methods:** We include the following ADMM-typed algorithms for solving the stochastic optimization problem (2) in our comparison:

1. Sto-SPB-PRSM: Our proposed method (Algorithm 6).
2. SADMM: The algorithm proposed in [12] (Algorithm 5).
3. OpSADMM: The algorithm proposed in [1].
4. BatchADMM: The original ADMM algorithm.

Note that all the above methods focus on solving the stochastic version of the problem (2), and they have the same time complexity for each update, so we present the objective function versus number of iterations in all the experiments. The algorithm proposed in [16] is an incremental algorithm that will use previous samples, so cannot be compared directly with the above four algorithms.

**Parameter Settings:** As talked about in SPRSM [10], the underdetermined relaxation factor $\alpha$ is easily determined. In fact, empirically, $\alpha \in [0.8, 0.9]$. Here, for simplicity, we take $\alpha = \gamma = 0.9$ in all simulations and examples and all simulation parameters are set similarly as in [10]. Also, all the three algorithms need $\beta$ (see Algorithm 4 and 5) and we follow [10, 1] to set $\beta = 1$. To show the flexibility of our proposed algorithm, we set $S = I_m$ and $T = 0$, which means we can add the proximal term in subproblem of $\boldsymbol{x}$.

### 5.1 Lasso

The Lasso model can be formulated as:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}} \big\{ \frac{1}{2} \|D\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{r}\|_2^2 + \mu \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 \big\} \tag{3}$$

where $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Re^d$ is the parameters, $\boldsymbol{r} \in \Re^n$ is the response vector, $D \in \Re^{n \times d}$ is the design matrix with $n$ sample points and $d$ features, $\mu > 0$ is the regularization parameter, $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the $\ell_1$-norm. For estimating a sparse parameter vector, we focus on the high dimensional problems ($n < d$).

To generate synthetic data, we draw each entry of the design matrix $D$ from $N(0, 1)$, and generate the underlying sparse $d$-dimensional parameter vector $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}$ with 100 nonzero entries from $N(0, 1)$. The noise vector $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is drawn from $N(0, 10^{-3}I)$, and the response vector $\boldsymbol{r} = D\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$. The regularization parameter is set as $\mu = 0.1\|D^T\boldsymbol{r}\|_\infty$, where we found the recovered entries have the similar number of nonzeroes with the underlying matrix $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}$. Using this approach, we generate two synthetic data for the Lasso problem, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Lasso Simulations

| Type | d | n | $\eta_0$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Simulation 1 | 400 | 200 | 1e-5 |
| Simulation 2 | 1000 | 500 | 1e-6 |

Now, we show how to use Sto-SPB-SPRSM to solve the Lasso problem (3). The problem can be rewritten as

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}} \frac{1}{2} \|D\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{r}\|_2^2 + \mu \|\boldsymbol{y}\|_1 \ \text{ s.t. } \ \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y} = 0,$$

which is equivalent to the stochastic optimization problem (2) with $\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}, \xi) = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{d}_\xi^T\boldsymbol{x} - r_\xi)^2$ and $\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}) = \mu\|\boldsymbol{y}\|_1$, where $\xi$ uniformly distributed in $\{1, 2, ...n\}$ and $\boldsymbol{d}_\xi$ is the transpose of the $\xi$-th row of $D$. When applying Algorithm 6, the update rules can be derived as shown in Algorithm 7, where the update rule for $\boldsymbol{y}$ is written by

$$\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \leftarrow S_{\frac{\mu}{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2}/\beta),$$

**Algorithm 7** Stochastic SPB-SPRSM (Lasso)

Initialize $\boldsymbol{x}_0$, $\boldsymbol{y}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0$ to be $\mathbf{0}$.
**for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
  Sample $i$ from $\{1, \cdots, n\}$
  $\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} \leftarrow \frac{(r_i - \boldsymbol{d}_i^T \boldsymbol{x}_k)\boldsymbol{d}_i + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k + \beta \boldsymbol{y}_k + (1+1/\eta_{k+1})\boldsymbol{x}_k}{\beta + 1 + 1/\eta_{k+1}}$.
  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k - \alpha\beta(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_k)$.
  $\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \leftarrow S_{\frac{\mu}{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2}/\beta)$.
  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2} - \gamma\beta(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})$.
**end for**




(a) Lasso Simulation 1




(b) Lasso Simulation 2




(c) Group Lasso




(d) Logistic Regression

Figure 1: Comparison with other stochastic optimization algorithms on synthetic datasets. Our proposed algorithm (Sto-SPB-SPRSM) converges faster than other methods.

where $S_a(\boldsymbol{x})$ is the soft-thresholding operator defined by

$$S_a(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{cases} x_i - a, & \text{if } x_i > a, \\ 0, & \text{if } |x_i| \leq a, \quad \forall i. \\ x_i + a, & \text{if } x_i < -a \end{cases}$$

The experimental results are shown in Fig1a and Fig1b. We can observed that in both settings our proposed algorithm is faster than existing algorithms.

### 5.2 Group Lasso

The Group Lasso model can be formulated as:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}} \{\frac{1}{2}\|D\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{r}\|_2^2 + \mu \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\boldsymbol{x}_i\|_2\}$$

where $N$ is the number of disjointed groups and $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \Re^{d_i}$ is the $d_i$-dimensional parameter vector of the $i$-th group. All other settings are the same as Lasso model.

**Algorithm 8** Stochastic SPB-SPRSM (Group Lasso)

Initialize $\boldsymbol{x}_0$, $\boldsymbol{y}_0$ and set $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 = 0$.
**for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
  Sample $i$ from $\{1, \cdots, n\}$
  $\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} \leftarrow \frac{(r_i - \boldsymbol{d}_i^T \boldsymbol{x}_k)\boldsymbol{d}_i + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k + \beta \boldsymbol{y}_k + (1+1/\eta_{k+1})\boldsymbol{x}_k}{\beta + 1 + 1/\eta_{k+1}}$.
  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k - \alpha\beta(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_k)$.
  $\boldsymbol{y}_{i,k+1} \leftarrow S_{\frac{\mu}{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{i,k+1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,k+1/2}/\beta), i = 1, 2, ..., N$.
  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2} - \gamma\beta(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})$.
**end for**

We generate the synthetic dataset by the following way: We set $n = 200$ and generate $N = 10$ blocks with size $d_i$ uniformly distributed between 1 and 50. $d = \sum_{i=1}^{N} d_i$. For the parameter $\boldsymbol{x}_i$, $5\%$ of entries are drawn from the standard normal distribution with the rest set to be zero. We set $\mu = 0.1 \max\{\|\boldsymbol{d}_1^T \boldsymbol{r}\|_\infty, \cdots, \|\boldsymbol{d}_N^T \boldsymbol{r}\|_\infty\}$. For the design matrix $D$ and response vector $r$, we use the same method as (5.1).

Next we derive the update rule of stochastic SPB-SPRSM for solving the Group Lasso problem. Here, $\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}, \xi)$ is still defined as $\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}, \xi) = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{d}_\xi^T \boldsymbol{x} - r_\xi)^2$ where $d_\xi$ is the transpose of the $\xi$-th row of design matrix $D$ and $r_i$ is the $i$-th entry of response vector $r$. The update rules can be derived as shown in Algorithm 8, where the update rule for $\boldsymbol{y}$ is again the soft-thresholding operator but for $L_2$ norm (block soft thresholding), which means $S_k(\boldsymbol{x})$ here is defined by $(S_k(\boldsymbol{x}))_i = (1 - k/\|x_i\|_2)_+ \times x_i, i = 1, 2, ...d$. Note that in Algorithm 8, we only need to update $\boldsymbol{y}$ for the current group at each iteration.

The experimental results are show in Fig 1c. We can observed that in sparse group lasso, our proposed algorithm still converges faster than other existing algorithms.

### 5.3 Sparse Logistic Regression

The sparse logistic regression model can be written as:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}} \{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log(1 + \exp(-r_i(\boldsymbol{d}_i^T \boldsymbol{x} + x_0))) + \mu \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1\},$$

where $n$ is the number of sample points; $\boldsymbol{d}_i$ is the $i$th row of the design matrix. Moreover, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Re^d$ is the $d$-dimensional parameter vector; $r_i \in \{1, -1\}(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$ are the $i$th response value. To generate the synthetic dataset, as the method in (5.1), we draw each entry of the normalized $n \times d$ design matrix $D$ from $N(0, 1)$, a sparse $d$-dimensional parameter vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ with 100 nonzero entries from $N(0, 1)$, the noise vector $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ from $N(0, 10^{-3}I)$, the response vector is $r = \text{sign}(D\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon})$. For simplicity, we set $\mu = 1$.

Similar to the previous two cases, we can transform the sparse logistic regression problem into (2) by setting $\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}, \xi) = \log(1 + \exp(-r_\xi \boldsymbol{d}_\xi^T \boldsymbol{x}))$ and $\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}) = \mu \|\boldsymbol{y}\|_1$. We can then derive the update rule, as shown in Algorithm 9. Note that the step for updating $\boldsymbol{y}$ is the same as the Lasso problem. The simulation results are shown in Fig.1d. We can observed that in sparse logistic regression model, our proposed algorithm still converges faster than other algorithms.

### 5.4 Comparisons on Real Datasets

Finally, we compare our proposed algorithm with existing ADMM-typed algorithms on real datasets. We test the convergence speed for solving the Lasso problem, and we consider the following three datasets in Table 2. For simplicity, we test all the algorithms with $\mu = 10, 1$ for all the three datasets. Note that when $\mu = 10$, the solution is sparse, while the solution will be dense when $\mu = 1$ for all the datasets. For the step size, we set $\eta_{\text{init}} = 10^{-6}$ for all the methods. Note that the BatchADMM converges much slower than other methods, so we ignore the comparison here. The results are shown in Figure 2d, 2e and 2f. We can clearly see that our proposed SSPRSM algorithm converges faster than other methods, especially when $\mu = 10$ (which means the solution is sparse).

**Algorithm 9** Stochastic SPB-SPRSM (Logistic Regression)

Initialize $x_0$, $y_0$ and set $\lambda_0 = 0$.
**for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
  Sample $i$ from $\{1, \cdots, n\}$
  $\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} \leftarrow \frac{(r_i \boldsymbol{d}_i/(1+\exp(r_i(\boldsymbol{d}_i^T \boldsymbol{x}_k + x_0))) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k + \beta \boldsymbol{y}_k + (1+1/\eta_{k+1})\boldsymbol{x}_k}{\beta + 1 + 1/\eta_{k+1}}$.
  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k - \alpha\beta(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_k)$.
  $\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \leftarrow S_{\frac{\mu}{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2}/\beta)$.
  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2} - \gamma\beta(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})$.
**end for**




(a) bodyfat, $\mu = 10$ (b) a9a, $\mu = 10$ (c) E2006, $\mu = 10$

(d) bodyfat, $\mu = 1$ (e) a9a, $\mu = 1$ (f) E2006, $\mu = 1$

Figure 2: Comparison with other stochastic optimization algorithms on real datasets. The $x$-axis is number of updates (each using only one training sample). Note that SADMM and OpSADMM almost overlap on the E2006 dataset. We observe that our proposed algorithm (Sto-SPB-SPRSM) converges faster than other methods, especially when the solution is sparse ($\mu = 10$).

## 6 Summary and future work

In this paper, we have proposed another variant of SPRSM: Stochastic SPB-SPRSM. Using approximated augmented Lagrange function, our proposed algorithm can be applied to a general class of stochastic optimization problem with linear constraints, where the proximal function may not be easily computable. Moreover, in our proposed algorithm, each iteration only requires one or a small subset of samples, which is suitable for large-scale machine learning problems with large number of samples. Furthermore, we proved the $O(1/\sqrt{t})$ convergence rate for convex functions, and $O(\log(t)/t)$ convergence rate for strongly convex function. Experimental results show that our proposed algorithm is much faster than existing algorithms published in the past few years on real datasets.

Based on the main task: solving the subproblem, $x$-optimization problem, of Stochastic SPB-SPRSM in more general machine learning model, such as Graph-Guided Support Vector Machine, we may consider a more general stochastic algorithm where we can not only strength the convergence rate but also make subproblem easy to solve. Moreover, our splitting problem is only about two separable functions. So, applying our algorithm to a more general splitting problem, where we may have $n$ separable functions, is also our research topic.

Table 2: Real Datasets

| | $d$ | $n$ | $\gamma$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bodyfat | 14 | 252 | 1, 10 |
| a9a | 123 | 32,561 | 1, 10 |
| E2006 | 150,360 | 16,087 | 1, 10 |

## References


[1] Samaneh Azadi and Suvrit Sra. Towards an optimal stochastic alternating direction method of multipliers. In *ICML*, 2014.

[2] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein. Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 3(1):1–122, 2011.

[3] J. Douglas and H.H. Rachford. On the numerical solution of the heat conduction problem in 2 and 3 space variables. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 82, 1956.

[4] J. Eckstein and D. P Bertsekas. On the douglas-rachford splitting method and the proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone operators. *Mathematical Programming*, 55(1-3), 1992.

[5] D. Gabay. Applications of the method of multipliers to variational inequalities in augmented lagrange methods: Applications to the solution of boundary-valued problems. *M. Fortin and R. Glowinski, eds., North–Holland, Amsterdam*, 1983.

[6] D. Gabay and B Mercier. A dual algorithm for the solution of nonlinear variational problems via finite element approximation. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 2(1), 1976.

[7] R. Glowinski and Marroco. A. sur lapproximation, par elements nis dordre un, et la resolution, par penalisationdualite, dune classe de problems de dirichlet non lineares. *Revue Francaise dAutomatique, Informatique, et Recherche Operationelle*, 9(2), 1975.

[8] R. Glowinski and P. L. Tallec. Augmented lagrangian and operator-splitting methods in nonlinear mechanics. *Studies in Applied and Numerical Mathematics, SIAM*, 1989.

[9] Yan Gu, Bo Jiang, and Deren Han. A semi-proximal-based contractive peaceman-rachford splitting method. *SIAM*, 2015.

[10] B. He, H. Liu, Z. Wang, and X. Yuan. A strictly contractive peaceman-rachford splitting method for convex programming. *SIAM J.Optim*, 24(3), 2014.

[11] P.L. Lions and B. Mercier. Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 16, 1979.

[12] Hua Ouyang, Niao He, Long Q. Tran, and Alexander Gray. Stochastic alternating direction method of multipliers. *ICML*, 2013.

[13] D.W. Peaceman and Jr. H.H. Rachford. The numerical solution of parabolic and elliptic differential equations. *J. Soc. Indust. Appl. Math.*, (3), 1955.

[14] T. Suzuki. Dual averaging and proximal gradient descent for online alternating direction multiplier method. In *ICML*, 2013.

[15] H. Wang and A. Banerjee. Online alternating direction method. *ICML*, 2012.

[16] Leon Wenliang Zhong and James T. Kwok. Fast stochastic alternating direction method of multipliers. In *ICML*, 2014.

# 7 Appendix

We first summary the iteration scheme of Stochastic SPB-SPRSM algorithm. We define the first-order approximated augmented Lagrangian function as follows:

$$\hat{L}_{\beta,k}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}_k) + \langle \theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1}),\boldsymbol{x}\rangle + \theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}) - \langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, A\boldsymbol{x}+B\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{b}\rangle + \frac{\beta}{2}\|A\boldsymbol{x}+B\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{b}\|^2 + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k\|^2}{2\eta_{k+1}}$$

The Stochastic SPB-SPRSM is equivalent to minimize the $\hat{L}_{\beta,k}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. We have its update scheme:

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} = \arg\min\limits_{\boldsymbol{x}\in X}\left\{\hat{L}_{\beta,k}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}_k,\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k) + \dfrac{\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k\|_S^2}{2}\right\} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k - \alpha\beta(A\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}+B\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{b}) \\ \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} = \arg\min\limits_{\boldsymbol{y}\in Y}\left\{\hat{L}_{\beta,k}(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1},\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2}) + \dfrac{\|\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2}{2}\right\} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2} - \gamma\beta(A\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}+B\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{b}) \end{cases}$$

Thus, plug in $\hat{L}_{\beta,k}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and we get the final iteration scheme:

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} = \arg\min\limits_{\boldsymbol{x}\in X}\left\{\langle \theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1}),x\rangle - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k^T A\boldsymbol{x} + \dfrac{\beta}{2}\|A\boldsymbol{x}+B\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{b}\|^2 + \dfrac{\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k\|^2}{2\eta_{k+1}} + \dfrac{\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k\|_S^2}{2}\right\} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k - \alpha\beta(A\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}+B\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{b}) \\ \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} = \arg\min\limits_{\boldsymbol{y}\in Y}\left\{\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2}^T B\boldsymbol{y} + \dfrac{\beta}{2}\|A\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}+B\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{b}\|^2 + \dfrac{\|\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2}{2}\right\} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2} - \gamma\beta(A\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}+B\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{b}) \end{cases}$$

### 7.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Invoking the optimality condition for the iteration of $\boldsymbol{x}$, we have

$$\langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1},\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1})\rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1},\frac{1}{\eta_{k+1}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{x}_k)\rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}, S(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{x}_k) - A^T\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k + \beta A^T(A\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}+B\boldsymbol{y}_k-b)\rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{x}\in X$$

We will transfer this inequality term by term. For the first term on the left hand side, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1},\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1})\rangle \\ &\quad= \langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k,\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k)\rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k,\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1})-\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k)\rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{x}_k-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1},\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1})\rangle \\ &\quad= \langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k,\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k)\rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k,\delta_{k+1}\rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{x}_k-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1},\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1})\rangle \\ &\quad\leq \theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}) - \theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}_k) + \langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k,\delta_{k+1}\rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta_{k+1}}\|\boldsymbol{x}_k-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{\eta_{k+1}}{2}\|\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1})\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The second equality is based on the definition of $\delta_{k+1}$ and the last inequality is based on Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. For the second term on the left hand side, we utilize the equaltiy

$$\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_G^2 - \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_G^2 = \|\boldsymbol{a}-\boldsymbol{b}\|_G^2 + 2\boldsymbol{b}^T G(\boldsymbol{a}-\boldsymbol{b}) \tag{2}$$

Here, we set $\boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}$, then we get

$$\langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1},\frac{1}{\eta_{k+1}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{x}_k)\rangle = \frac{1}{2\eta_{k+1}}(\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{x}_k\|^2) \tag{3}$$

So, we combine (1) and (3) and have the final inequality of $\boldsymbol{x}$,

$$\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}) - \theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}_k) + \langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k,\delta_{k+1}\rangle + \frac{\eta_{k+1}}{2}\|\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1})\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta_{k+1}}(\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}\|^2) + \langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}, S(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{x}_k) - A^T\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k + \beta A^T(A\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}+B\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{b})\rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{x}\in X \tag{4}$$

Invoking the optimality condition for the iteration of $\boldsymbol{y}$, for $\forall \boldsymbol{y} \in Y$, we have

$$\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y})-\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})+\langle \boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}, T(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)-B^T\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2}+\beta B^T(A\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}+B\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{b})\geq 0 \quad (5)$$

Based on the definition of $\boldsymbol{r}_k$, $\boldsymbol{r}(\boldsymbol{w})$, $\theta(\boldsymbol{u})$ and $F(\boldsymbol{w})$, we can further get the equality of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2} &= \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}+\gamma\beta\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k &= \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1/2}+\alpha\beta(A\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}+B\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{b}) = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}+\gamma\beta\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}+\alpha\beta\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}+\alpha\beta B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\\ &= \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}+(\alpha+\gamma)\beta\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}+\alpha\beta B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\end{aligned}$$

So, we have

$$\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\gamma}B(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)+\frac{1}{(\alpha+\gamma)\beta}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k)=0 \quad (6)$$

Then, we unify (4), (5) and (6)

$$\begin{aligned}&\theta(\boldsymbol{u})-(\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}_k)+\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})+\langle \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k,\delta_{k+1}\rangle+\frac{\eta_{k+1}}{2}\|\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k,\xi_{k+1})\|^2+\frac{d_k}{2\eta_{k+1}}\\ &+\langle \boldsymbol{w}-\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1},\begin{pmatrix} S(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{x}_k)\\ T(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)\\ 0\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix} 0\\ \alpha\beta B^T\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}+(1-\alpha)\beta B^TB(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)\\ -\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\gamma}B(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)+\frac{1}{(\alpha+\gamma)\beta}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k)\end{pmatrix}\rangle\\ &+\langle \boldsymbol{w}-\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1},\begin{pmatrix} A^T\\ B^T\\ 0\end{pmatrix}((1-\alpha-\gamma)\beta\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}+(1-\alpha)\beta B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}))\rangle\geq\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w},F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle\end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $d_k=\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_k\|^2-\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}\|^2$. □

### 7.2 Proof of Lemma 2

We will further simplify the inequality (7). Denote the first line in (7) as $P_1$, the second line as $P_2$ and the third line (right hand side) as $P_3$. Handle $P_2$ and $P_3$ respectively.
For $P_2$, using (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\begin{pmatrix} \alpha\beta B^T\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}+(1-\alpha)\beta B^TB(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)\\ -\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\gamma}B(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)+\frac{1}{(\alpha+\gamma)\beta}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k)\end{pmatrix}\\ &=\begin{pmatrix} (1-\alpha)\beta B^TB(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)+\alpha\beta B^T(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\gamma}B(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)-\frac{1}{(\alpha+\gamma)\beta}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k))\\ -\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\gamma}B(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)+\frac{1}{(\alpha+\gamma)\beta}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k)\end{pmatrix}\\ &=\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha+\gamma-\alpha\gamma}{\alpha+\gamma}\beta B^TB(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\gamma}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k)\\ -\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\gamma}B(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)+\frac{1}{(\alpha+\gamma)\beta}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k)\end{pmatrix}\end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Based on the definition of $H$, $P$ and $G$, we rewrite $P_2$ as

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle \boldsymbol{w}-\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1},\begin{pmatrix} S(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{x}_k)\\ T(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)\\ 0\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix} 0\\ \alpha\beta B^T\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}+(1-\alpha)\beta B^TB(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)\\ -\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\gamma}B(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)+\frac{1}{(\alpha+\gamma)\beta}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k)\end{pmatrix}\rangle\\ &=\langle \boldsymbol{w}-\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1},\begin{pmatrix} S(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{x}_k)\\ T(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)\\ 0\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix} 0\\ H(\boldsymbol{v}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{v}_k)\end{pmatrix}\rangle=(\boldsymbol{w}-\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})^TG(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w}_k)\end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

For $P_3$, using $(A\ B\ 0)(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w})=\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{r}(\boldsymbol{w})=\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w},\begin{pmatrix} A^T\\ B^T\\ 0\end{pmatrix}((1-\alpha-\gamma)\beta\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}+(1-\alpha)\beta B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}))\rangle\\ &=\langle \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{r}(\boldsymbol{w}),(1-\alpha-\gamma)\beta\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}+(1-\alpha)\beta B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle\\ &=(1-\alpha-\gamma)\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2+(1-\alpha)\beta\langle \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1},B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle\end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

So, combine (9) and (10), we get following inequality

$$P_1+(\boldsymbol{w}-\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})^T G(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w}_k) \geq (1-\alpha-\gamma)\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2+(1-\alpha)\beta\langle \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}, B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle+\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle \tag{11}$$

Using the equality (2) again, we expand the second term on the left hand side

$$(\boldsymbol{w}-\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})^T G(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w}_k) = \frac{1}{2}(\|\boldsymbol{w}_k-\boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 - \|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 - \|\boldsymbol{w}_k-\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}\|_G^2) \tag{12}$$

and based on the definition of $G$

$$\|\boldsymbol{w}_k-\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}\|_G^2 = \|\boldsymbol{u}_k-\boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + \|\boldsymbol{v}_k-\boldsymbol{v}_{k+1}\|_H^2 \tag{13}$$

Plug (12) and (13) into (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}2P_1 + \|\boldsymbol{w}_k-\boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 - \|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 \geq& \|\boldsymbol{u}_k-\boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + \|\boldsymbol{v}_k-\boldsymbol{v}_{k+1}\|_H^2 + 2(1-\alpha-\gamma)\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &+ 2(1-\alpha)\beta\langle \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}, B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle\end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\boldsymbol{v}_k-\boldsymbol{v}_{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{n_2} & 0 \\ \alpha\beta B & (\alpha+\gamma)\beta I_m\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\end{pmatrix} = M\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\end{pmatrix}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{v}_k-\boldsymbol{v}_{k+1}\|_H^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\end{pmatrix}^T M^T H M \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} (1-\alpha)\beta B^T B & 0 \\ 0 & (\alpha+\gamma)\beta I_m\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\end{pmatrix} \\ &= (1-\alpha)\beta\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2 + (\alpha+\gamma)\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Plug this equality to above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}2P_1 + \|\boldsymbol{w}_k-\boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 - \|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 \geq& \|\boldsymbol{u}_k-\boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + (1-\alpha)\beta\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2 + (2-\alpha-\gamma)\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &+ 2(1-\alpha)\beta\langle \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}, B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

□

### 7.3 Proof of Lemma 3

In this theorem, we focus on the term $\langle \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}, B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle$. Based on the optimality condition of the iteration of $\boldsymbol{y}$, we have following two inequalities:

$$\begin{cases}\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y})-\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})+\langle \boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}, T(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)-B^T\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}+(1-\gamma)\beta B^T\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\rangle \geq 0 \\ \theta_2(\boldsymbol{y})-\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_k)+\langle \boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{y}_k, T(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k-1})-B^T\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k+(1-\gamma)\beta B^T\boldsymbol{r}_k\rangle \geq 0\end{cases} \quad \forall \boldsymbol{y}\in Y$$

Choose $\boldsymbol{y}$ to be $\boldsymbol{y}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}$ in two inequalities respectively

$$\begin{cases}\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_k)-\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})+\langle \boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}, T(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k)-B^T\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}+(1-\gamma)\beta B^T\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\rangle \geq 0 \\ \theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})-\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_k)+\langle \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k, T(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k-1})-B^T\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k+(1-\gamma)\beta B^T\boldsymbol{r}_k\rangle \geq 0\end{cases}$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}), -\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}+(1-\gamma)\beta\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\rangle \geq \|\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2 - (\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_k)-\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})) \\ &\langle B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}), \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k-(1-\gamma)\beta\boldsymbol{r}_k\rangle \geq -\langle \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k, T(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k-1})\rangle - (\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})-\theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_k))\end{aligned}$$

Combine these two inequalities together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}), \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}+(1-\gamma)\beta\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\rangle - (1-\gamma)\beta\langle B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}), \boldsymbol{r}_k\rangle& \\ \geq \frac{1}{2}(\|\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2 - \|\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k-1}\|_T^2)&\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}, B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle \geq& \frac{1-\gamma}{1+\alpha}\langle \boldsymbol{r}_k, B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle - \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)\beta}(\|\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2 - \|\boldsymbol{y}_k-\boldsymbol{y}_{k-1})\|_T^2)\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

□

### 7.4 Proof of Lemma 4

We use (15) and (16) to get the final conclusion.

$$\begin{aligned}2P_1 + \|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 - \|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 \geq{}& \|\boldsymbol{u}_k - \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + (1-\alpha)\beta\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2 + (2-\alpha-\gamma)\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &+ 2(1-\alpha)\beta\langle \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}, B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle \\ ={}& \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1} \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} (1-\alpha)\beta B^T B & (1-\alpha)\beta \\ (1-\alpha)\beta & (2-\alpha-\gamma)\beta I_m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \|\boldsymbol{u}_k - \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle\end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of $K$ and $M$, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1} \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} (1-\alpha)\beta B^T B & (1-\alpha)\beta \\ (1-\alpha)\beta & (2-\alpha-\gamma)\beta I_m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} = (\boldsymbol{v}_k - \boldsymbol{v}_{k+1})^T M^{-T} K M^{-1} (\boldsymbol{v}_k - \boldsymbol{v}_{k+1})$$

So, we will discuss the following final inequality in several cases

$$2P_1 + \|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 - \|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 \geq \|\boldsymbol{u}_k - \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + (\boldsymbol{v}_k - \boldsymbol{v}_{k+1})^T M^{-T} K M^{-1} (\boldsymbol{v}_k - \boldsymbol{v}_{k+1}) + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle \tag{17}$$

We first assume $\alpha \in [0, 1)$.

**Case 1**, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$

If then, $K$ is positive definite matrix. We have

$$M^T H M = \begin{pmatrix} (1-\alpha)\beta B^T B & 0 \\ 0 & (\alpha+\gamma)\beta I_m \end{pmatrix}$$

It's easy to see $K \succeq c M^T H M$ where $c = \frac{1-\sqrt{1-(\alpha+\gamma)(1-\gamma)}}{\alpha+\gamma} \in (0, 1)$

So, based on (17), we get

$$2P_1 + \|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 - \|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 \geq c\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}\|_G^2 + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle \tag{18}$$

**Case 2**, $\gamma = 1$

Combine (15) and (16)

$$\begin{aligned}&2P_1 + (\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k-1}\|_T^2) - (\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2) \\ &\geq \|\boldsymbol{u}_k - \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + (1-\alpha)\beta\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2 - \frac{2(1-\alpha)\alpha}{1+\alpha}\beta\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2 \\ &+ (2-\alpha-\gamma)\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2 + 2(1-\gamma)\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\beta\langle \boldsymbol{r}_k, B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle \\ &= \|\boldsymbol{u}_k - \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{1+\alpha}\beta\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2 + (2-\alpha-\gamma)\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &+ 2(1-\gamma)\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\beta\langle \boldsymbol{r}_k, B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Plug in $\gamma = 1$, we rewrite the right hand side term as

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{u}_k - \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{1+\alpha}\beta\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2 + (1-\alpha)\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2 + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle \\ &= \|\boldsymbol{u}_k - \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}((1-\alpha)\beta\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2 + (1+\alpha)\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2) + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle \\ &= \|\boldsymbol{u}_k - \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{v}_k - \boldsymbol{v}_{k+1}\|_H^2 + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle \\ &\geq \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}\|_G^2 + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle\end{aligned}$$

The second equation is because of (14). So, in this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&2P_1 + (\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k-1}\|_T^2) - (\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2) \\ &\geq \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}\|_G^2 + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

**Case 3**, $\gamma \in (1, \frac{1-\alpha+\sqrt{(1+\alpha)^2+4(1-\alpha^2)}}{2})$
Use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$-2\langle \boldsymbol{r}_k, B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\rangle \geq -\delta\|\boldsymbol{r}_k\|^2 - \frac{1}{\delta}\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2$$

So, based on (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&2P_1 + (\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k-1}\|_T^2) - (\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2)\\
&\geq \|\boldsymbol{u}_k - \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + (\frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{1+\alpha} - (\gamma-1)\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\frac{1}{\delta})\beta\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2\\
&- \delta(\gamma-1)\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\beta(\|\boldsymbol{r}_k\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2) + (2-\alpha-\gamma-\delta(\gamma-1)\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha})\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2\\
&+ 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Transpose the corresponding terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&2P_1 + (\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k-1}\|_T^2 + \delta(\gamma-1)\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_k\|^2)\\
&- (\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2 + \delta(\gamma-1)\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2)\\
&\geq \|\boldsymbol{u}_k - \boldsymbol{u}_{k+1}\|_P^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}(1 - \frac{\gamma-1}{1-\alpha}\frac{1}{\delta})(1-\alpha)\beta\|B(\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k+1})\|^2\\
&+ (\gamma-1)\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}(\frac{1+\alpha}{\gamma-1} - \frac{1+\alpha}{1-\alpha} - \delta)\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2 + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

We choose $\tau = \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\min(1 - \frac{\gamma-1}{1-\alpha}\frac{1}{\delta}, \frac{\gamma-1}{\alpha+\gamma}(\frac{1+\alpha}{\gamma-1} - \frac{1+\alpha}{1-\alpha} - \delta))$ where

$$\begin{cases} 1 - \dfrac{\gamma-1}{1-\alpha}\dfrac{1}{\delta} > 0 \\ \dfrac{1+\alpha}{\gamma-1} - \dfrac{1+\alpha}{1-\alpha} - \delta > 0 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \delta \in (\frac{\gamma-1}{1-\alpha}, \frac{1+\alpha}{\gamma-1} - \frac{1+\alpha}{1-\alpha}) \text{ and this interval is reasonable.}$$

So, after this calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&2P_1 + (\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k-1}\|_T^2 + \delta(\gamma-1)\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_k\|^2)\\
&- (\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2 + \delta(\gamma-1)\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2)\\
&\geq \tau\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}\|_G^2 + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Finally, combine three cases (18), (20) and (21), we get final conclusions

$$\begin{aligned}
&2P_1 + (\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \eta_\alpha\|\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k-1}\|_T^2 + \rho_{\alpha,\gamma}\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_k\|^2)\\
&- (\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \eta_\alpha\|\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2 + \rho_{\alpha,\gamma}\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2)\\
&\geq \tau_{\alpha,\gamma}\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}\|_G^2 + 2\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $\rho_{\alpha,\gamma}, \eta_\alpha \geq 0$, $\tau_{\alpha,\gamma} \in (0,1)$, $\alpha \in [0,1)$ and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1-\alpha+\sqrt{(1+\alpha)^2+4(1-\alpha^2)}}{2})$. □

### 7.5 Proof of Theorem 1

Because of the monotonicity of $F(\boldsymbol{w})$, i.e.

$$\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})\rangle \geq \langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w})\rangle$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}, F(\boldsymbol{w})\rangle \leq P_1 &+ \frac{1}{2}(\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \eta_\alpha\|\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k-1}\|_T^2 + \rho_{\alpha,\gamma}\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_k\|^2)\\
&- \frac{1}{2}(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \eta_\alpha\|\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2 + \rho_{\alpha,\gamma}\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2)
\end{aligned}$$

Plug in $\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{w}^*$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} f_k =& \frac{1}{2}(\|\boldsymbol{w}_k - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \eta_\alpha \|\boldsymbol{y}_k - \boldsymbol{y}_{k-1}\|_T^2 + \rho_{\alpha,\gamma}\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_k\|^2) \\ & - \frac{1}{2}(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}\|_G^2 + \eta_\alpha \|\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}_k\|_T^2 + \rho_{\alpha,\gamma}\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}\|^2) \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}_k) + \theta_2(\boldsymbol{y}_{k+1}) - \theta(\boldsymbol{u}^*) + \langle \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}^*, F(\boldsymbol{w}^*)\rangle \\ & \leq \langle \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}_k, \delta_{k+1}\rangle + \frac{\eta_{k+1}}{2}\|\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \xi_{k+1})\|^2 + \frac{d_k}{2\eta_{k+1}} + f_k \end{aligned}$$

Based on the definition of $\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_k$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_k$, for all $k = 1, 2...t$, sum the above inequality and due to the convexity of $\theta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_t) - \theta(\boldsymbol{u}^*) + \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_t - \boldsymbol{w}^*, F(\boldsymbol{w}^*)\rangle \\ & \leq \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\langle \delta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{x}^* - \boldsymbol{x}_k\rangle + \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\eta_{k+1}\|\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \xi_{k+1})\|^2 + \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\frac{d_k}{\eta_{k+1}} + \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^{t} f_k \\ & \leq \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\langle \delta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{x}^* - \boldsymbol{x}_k\rangle + \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\eta_{k+1}\|\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \xi_{k+1})\|^2 + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}^* - \boldsymbol{x}_1\|^2}{2t\eta_{t+1}} \\ & + \frac{1}{2t}(\|\boldsymbol{w}_1 - \boldsymbol{w}^*\|_G^2 + \eta_\alpha\|\boldsymbol{y}_1 - \boldsymbol{y}_0\|^2 + \rho_{\alpha,\gamma}\beta\|\boldsymbol{r}_1\|^2) \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Take the expectation, under the assumption of (1) and (2), we get

$$E(\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_t) - \theta(\boldsymbol{u}^*) + \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_t - \boldsymbol{w}^*, F(\boldsymbol{w}^*)\rangle) \leq \frac{N^2}{2t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\eta_{k+1} + \frac{D_X^2}{2t\eta_{t+1}} + \frac{D}{2t}$$

where $D$ is a constant and $D_X$, $N$ as defined in notation and assumption.
If we set $\eta_k = CK^{-p}$, then

$$\frac{1}{t}(\frac{N^2}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\eta_{k+1} + \frac{D_X^2}{2\eta_{t+1}}) \leq \frac{D_X^2}{2Ct^{1-p}} + \frac{N^2C}{2(1-p)t^p}$$

Set $p = 1/2$, then we get $E(\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_t) - \theta(\boldsymbol{u}^*) + \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_t - \boldsymbol{w}^*, F(\boldsymbol{w}^*)\rangle) \leq O(1/\sqrt{t})$. □

### 7.6 Proof of Theorem 2

Based on the definition of strong-convexity,

$$\theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}) - \theta_1(\boldsymbol{x}_k) \geq \langle \theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k), \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}_k\rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}\|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}_k\|^2$$

As showed in (23), for $\forall \boldsymbol{w} \in W$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_t) - \theta(\boldsymbol{u}^*) + \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_t - \boldsymbol{w}^*, F(\boldsymbol{w}^*)\rangle \leq & \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\langle \delta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{x}^* - \boldsymbol{x}_k\rangle + \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\eta_{k+1}\|\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \xi_{k+1})\|^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\left((\frac{1}{2\eta_{k+1}} - \frac{\mu}{2})\|\boldsymbol{x}_k - \boldsymbol{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\eta_{k+1}}\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{x}^*\|^2\right) + \frac{D}{2t} \end{aligned}$$

So, we take the expectation

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E(\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_t) - \theta(\boldsymbol{u}^*) + \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_t - \boldsymbol{w}^*, F(\boldsymbol{w}^*)\rangle) \\
&\leq \frac{D}{2t} + \frac{1}{t} E\left(\sum_{k=1}^{t}\left((\frac{1}{2\eta_{k+1}} - \frac{\mu}{2})\|\boldsymbol{x}_k - \boldsymbol{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\eta_{k+1}}\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{x}^*\|^2\right)\right) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2t} E(\sum_{k=1}^{t} \eta_{k+1}\|\theta_1'(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \xi_{k+1})\|^2) \\
&\leq \frac{D}{2t} + \frac{N^2}{2t}\sum_{k=1}^{t}\frac{1}{\mu k} + \frac{1}{t} E\left(\sum_{k=1}^{t}\left(\frac{\mu k}{2}\|\boldsymbol{x}_k - \boldsymbol{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{\mu(k+1)}{2}\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{x}^*\|^2\right)\right) \\
&\leq \frac{D}{2t} + \frac{N^2(1+\log t)}{2\mu t} \\
&\leq \frac{D}{2t} + \frac{N^2 \log t}{\mu t}
\end{aligned}
$$

□